HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* — *Contributing Editors:* FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

VOL. XII, No. 4 — SATURDAY, JANUARY 22, 1955 — WASHINGTON, D. C.

Around The Town: Biggest concealed time-bomb in the Budget, made public within the past few days, is a clause concerning Red China and the UN. It says: "It is the sense of the Senate that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the UN as a representative of China." What it means, among members of the powerful appropriations committees, is: we shall cut off funds to the UN if that body admits the Communist Chinese Government to membership. A majority of both parties in Congress is strong for this.

● Unrevealed in the Press is the fact that Carmine DeSapio, the Tammany boss who in effect runs Governor Harriman and New York State, has as one of his advisers that highly controversial former aide of Senator McCarthy — Roy Cohn. DeSapio, last November, politically killed Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., and — it is believed — will be the dominant power (controlling New York's delegation) in naming the Democratic nominee for President in 1956. It should be mentioned that there are some in the vicinity of the Tammany wigwam who assert DeSapio will put up Cohn as Democratic nominee for Senator in 1958, opposing GOP Senator Ives for re-election. Last November, Ives lost the race for New York Governorship, in no small part because he opposed Joe McCarthy.

● Dag Hammerskjold, the UN Secretary, whose travels seem to prove so unrewarding diplomatically, is not so highly regarded in his native Sweden as he is in New York papers. Well-informed Swedes express astonishment at his prestige in much of our press. They say that at home in Sweden he is deemed an extreme left-winger in politics.

Hammerskjold — it is said in Washington — weakened the American position on the U.S. captives in China before he had scarcely unpacked his bag in Peiping. The Red China bosses found him an easy emissary with whom to deal.

Now, Eisenhower comes out with a "cease-fire" proposal. The record on "cease-fire" pacts is very bad. Experience shows they only give the Reds time for a bigger military build-up. Then the Reds violate "cease-fire." To the Capital, it sounds like another Ike move for "co-existence." People ask: who promoted this — Churchill?

● Tough as was Senator Knowland's anti-Administration speech in Chicago on January 18, charging that Hammerskjold's mission to China to free our fliers was a "failure", it was no more provocative than his address in Houston on January 13. The latter received no coverage in the Eastern "co-existence" papers and so has become a prized "bootleg" piece of reading matter in Washington, passed from hand to hand. It was reprinted in the *Congressional Record* appendix for January 14. In it, the California Senator plumped for States Rights, vigorously attacked "co-existence" and its advocates in the U.S., underlined the fact that in addition to the imprisoned fliers there are over 900 more American prisoners in Red jails, and raked the record of the UN in Korea. The Senator plans more speeches in the Middle West and East in coming weeks.

● Split in the Democratic ranks is as wide as in the GOP. Those who circulate on Capitol Hill know that there's a fierce tug-of-war between conservative Democrats (mostly but not entirely from the South) and the "liberals" of the Party. The latter virtually constitute a mouthpiece for the labor unions, especially the CIO, and they run the Democratic National Committee. Observers note how the "liberals" have moved in on the committee set up to investigate the recent rise in the stock market.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Robert A. Wallace, long on the staff of socialistic Senator Paul Douglas, is slated to run this show.

● Watch for a big drive by the unions to get various states to repeal the "right to work" laws now in force in 17 states. These statutes outlaw labor contract provisions that workers must become union members. The union drive has won public sympathy from Ike's Secretary of Labor Mitchell. The latter, at the recent meeting of the CIO in Los Angeles, came out flatly against the "right to work" laws. Watch also for an upsurge of counteraction from people like former Congressman Fred A. Hartley, Jr. (co-author with Taft of the famous law to harness the labor bosses).

● A canvass of business leaders shows some coolness to General Lucius Clay's proposal for a 10-year, $100 billion national road program. They strongly support Senator Byrd's criticism of the financing of such a program "outside the Federal Budget;" they think the planned capital outlay should be cut down and spread over 20 years; and they believe that the states should shoulder a larger portion of the obligation.

● There are widespread demands that the speech which General MacArthur will deliver on January 26 in Los Angeles should be broadcast on a national hookup. According to last reports, only local stations plan to broadcast it. Hence, the networks are under fire.

Somersault: The White House's "co-existence" policy brought a rather striking reversal of attitude, when Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson, on January 17, called for increased free world trade with Communist countries in non-military goods. Appearing before the House Ways and Means Committee, Wilson asserted that many items could be traded with Russia and other Iron Curtain countries so as to "ultimately strengthen the free world." He said America would benefit doubly, not only from the actual exchange of goods but also by helping "the people in those countries eliminate their fear and antagonism for our country — we've got to do that ultimately."

Yet, less than two years ago, Mr. Wilson sang a somewhat different tune. In a letter addressed to Senator Joseph McCarthy, Chairman of the Senate Government Operations Committee, he denounced foreign trade with Iron Curtain countries in very sweeping terms. The letter was dated March 29, 1953, and said: "The Department of Defense believes that contributions to the economic potential alone often directly, and almost always indirectly, contribute to any country's military potential. Therefore, the Department of Defense is convinced that any goods or any services reaching or serving those areas increase the capabilities of the Communist forces in Asia not only to continue but even to intensify and extend the present areas of aggression.

"The Department of Defense, including the three military services, has heartily supported this policy. This position on the part of the Department of Defense is predicated on the realistic view that the shipment of goods or the provision of services to the Communist Chinese or to the North Koreans contributes directly or indirectly to their economic and military potential."

Banana War: There is more than meets the eye in the news flashes on the hostilities in the Republic of Costa Rica — according to experts on Latin American affairs in the Capital. Newspaper roundups on the matter fail to recall some of the background of President Figueres of that country, now embroiled with rebels and with President Somoza of neighboring Nicaragua.

According to Ralph de Toledano, who knows his Latin America well, writing in the *American Mercury*, February, 1953, the Guatemalan "pattern" was visible in Costa Rica where "the Communists have reportedly made a deal with the leading candidate for the Presidency, Jose Figueres." This report jibes with the information gathered by experts in Washington, who regard the Costa Rica President as a militant socialist — having connections with the extreme left — and ambitious to create a federation of socialist republics in the Carribean area.

Such a dream fits in well with the present designs of Moscow, as analyzed by competent observers here. The Kremlin, badly defeated in its attempt openly to establish a Soviet bridgehead in Guatemala,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

now is reportedly seeking to work its way into regional control by "popular front" and "liberal" regimes in Central America.

In addition to such comments, some here are of the opinion that the U.S. blundered in selling fighting planes to Figueres. Not only is this action interpreted by other Latin Americans as "Yanqui intervention," but it is not liked by President Somoza of Nicaragua, one of the firmest friends of the U.S. among Latin Americans.

U.S. Post-War Aid to Communism: Since the end of World War II, the U.S. has given aid to Russia and her satellite states in excess of a billion dollars. As of June 30, 1954, this aid — comprising direct aid from the U.S. Treasury (gifts), bank loans outstanding and gifts from private agencies (such as the American Red Cross) — amounted to $1,325,050,000.

Assistance to Communist nations after the conclusion of World War II is somewhat incomprehensible. At the time the U.S. recognized Soviet Russia, Maxim Litvinoff, the Russian Ambassador, gave solemn assurances that the Soviet Union would cease conspiring for the overthrow of the U.S. Government — assurances which were never kept. At the time of our entry into World War II, the New Deal was fully aware of this double crossing. During the war the Roosevelt Administration went out of its way to protect the formidable growth of a Soviet espionage system in the nation. It was during the war that the Soviet Union laid the real ground work for a wholesale infiltration of America.

In 1949, Larry E. Kerley, former FBI operative, revealed to a Senate Committee just how far the Soviet espionage apparatus had been protected during the war by our own State Department. He testified that all during the war Soviet spies were not checked chiefly because our State Department withheld the right "to get out process for them which kept them from being arrested." He testified that the FBI was even prevented from picking up Americans who helped the Russians in their spy work, because if they had been arrested the whole Soviet apparatus would have been disclosed.

By the end of World War II, the Russians had seized Poland and it was clear as daylight that they intended world revolution. Why, then, post-war U.S. aid to Communism? Much of the aid given is squarely chargeable to Dean Acheson while he was in the State Department. The bulk of this assistance to Communism went into UNRRA, and it was Acheson's rulings which made it possible for the Russian Communists to use UNRRA food and clothing to coerce the Polish people into submission and to extend Soviet power into other parts of Europe. It was the Acheson law firm which arranged for a $90,000,000 loan to Soviet-controlled Poland — the approval of which was announced by Acheson in person while acting as Secretary of State in 1946. The American Ambassador to Poland, Arthur Bliss Lane, vigorously opposed the granting of the loan to Soviet-controlled Poland. Testimony of high Polish authorities subsequently showed that the money, including UNRRA grants, was used mainly to equip the Communist Secret Police in Poland, and to effect the submission of desperately hungry people.

Here is the picture of U.S. post-war aid to Communism:

1. Russia:
   - $ 1,800,000 — American Red Cross;
   - 186,380,000 — UNRRA;
   - 277,254,000 — continued Lend Lease in spite of the cessation of hostilities;
   - 222,493,000 — credit still outstanding and unpaid.
2. Poland:
   - $ 855,000 — American Red Cross;
   - 364,031,000 — UNRRA;
   - 92,000 — Lend Lease;
   - 68,669,000 — unpaid indebtedness.
3. Hungary:
   - $ 2,359,000 — UNRRA aid;
   - 12,794,000 — unpaid indebtedness.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

4. Czechoslovakia:

$ 75,000 — American Red Cross;
183,374,000 — UNRRA aid;
2,000 — Lend-Lease;
2,000 — agricultural commodities donated through private agencies;
4,870,000 — credits outstanding.

The total of all post-war aid to Russia and her satellites comes to $1,325,050,000.

Book Review: *Admiral Kimmel's Story*, by Husband E. Kimmel, Rear Adm. (USN, Ret'd). Published by Henry Regnery Company, 20 West Jackson Blvd., Chicago 4, Illinois. Price: $3.75. Reviewed by Willis J. Ballinger.

The Kimmel story can be appraised in the light of what has preceded it. It was John T. Flynn who first courageously raised the issue of Washington's political responsibility for Pearl Harbor and the innocence of both Short and Kimmel in a pamphlet published *during the late war* (1944). The Flynn pamphlet today takes literary rank with Emile Zola's celebrated "J'Accuse", which did so much to reverse the miscarriage of French justice in the case of Captain Alfred Dreyfus.

Then came George Morgenstern's *Pearl Harbor*, a classical example of the genius of the trained reportorial mind at its best. Highly accurate, the Morgenstern book was immediately subjected to a smear campaign — in spite of which it stirred the conscience of many citizens. In 1954, appeared Admiral Robert Theobald's *Final Secret of Pearl Harbor*. Theobald was the first trained naval expert to interpret for the public the military significance of the intercepted Japanese messages which had been carefully kept from Short and Kimmel. He was also the first to show authoritatively that the possession of this information by Washington and its failure to alert Hawaii on its own initiative — or at least to pass on such information promptly to Kimmel and Short — amounted either to unbelievable incompetence on the part of the heads of the Army and Navy, or to a deliberate intention in Washington to encourage the Japanese to fire the first shot.

The principal contributions of the Kimmel book to the truth about Pearl Harbor seem to me to be: (1) Admiral Kimmel's thorough analysis of the utterly insufficient information made available to him from Washington. (2) His *personal* experience with U.S. Justice Roberts' "kangaroo" tribunal of inquiry at Pearl Harbor where he (Kimmel) was subjected to highly unfair treatment and summarily found guilty. (Morgenstern says that Roberts has been "a proponent of war as a means of achieving world government.") (3) Throughout the Kimmel book are memorable passages; an account of how Captain Laurence Safford, USN, took his Navy life in his hands and informed Kimmel of the existence of the intercepted Japanese messages which had been carefully kept from him; the shocking story of how Captain Arthur McCollum, USN, on December 1, 1941 (6 days before Pearl Harbor) and again on December 4, tried desperately to alert the fleet at Pearl Harbor but was overruled; the accidental discovery by Kimmel of a *secret* White House file on Pearl Harbor which has never been publicly examined to this day; the threatening letters received by him after conviction by the Roberts' tribunal; and the agony of his daily existence. (4) The author offers an interesting explanation of what he would have done if he had received from Washington proper information *even two hours before the attack.*

As I read the Kimmel story I felt the presence of a tragic figure. Imaginatively I could see him before Pearl Harbor on the bridge of his flagship — erect, shoulders squared, justly proud of his long and distinguished service in the Navy of his country. I could see him after Pearl Harbor — a bewildered, broken man haunted by the false accusation that in substance he had negligently killed some 3,000 young Americans. I could visualize his sleepless nights, his days of terrible despair and finally — a pen scratching far into the night as its wielder struggled to record the Iliad of a nightmare.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $6. One year, $10. First class mail, one year, $11.50, six months, $6.75. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year $13; foreign (regular mail) one year, $12. Foreign airmail, $18. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. *Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.* Bound annual volume with index, $15.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XII, No. 4 HUMAN EVENTS January 22, 1955

"BILLIONITIS": THE DISEASE OF FOREIGN AID

By Eugene W. Castle

Mr. Castle, founder and former president of Castle Films, has devoted most of the past three years to making a personal investigation of what has happened to the billions of dollars the U.S. has spent abroad. His findings will be published soon in book form by the Devin-Adair Company. Title: *Billions, Blunders and Baloney!* As readers can judge from the title, it will be a no-holds-barred, bare-knuckled report on American give-aways and propaganda excesses abroad. If you wish to obtain a copy of the book send $3.50 to the Devin-Adair Company, Dept. 35, 23 East 26th Street, New York 10, N. Y.

If it were decided to declare a national dividend and to present to every family of three in the United States a bonus of $2,100, the total cost to the Treasury would not equal the amount which this nation has given away to foreign countries since 1940.

Such a mass handout would be greeted with horrified protest by most self-respecting Americans, and rightly so. And yet Congress has voted an equivalent amount for foreign give-aways without the batting of an eye. It is a striking instance of the irresponsible thinking of the elected representatives of the American people during these uncertain years.

The total of our benefactions (they are increasing every twelve months) now stands (1955) at $112 billions. If we pause to estimate the overdue domestic projects—new schools, health, slum clearance, rural rehabilitation, reclamation, power development, etc. — that these billions or a part of them would have bought if we had kept them at home, the foreign aid undertaking assumes a different and less alluring light. The question of whether we can afford our Lady Bountiful role confronts us challengingly as the hourglass of our economy becomes empty.

The trouble with our Washington rulers is that they are now suffering from a strange new disease known as billionitis. American legislators feel a curious vertigo when they get up into the rarefied heights of billions. They seem to lose all touch with reality. Men who would argue heatedly over a five-cent raise in a subway or bus fare unhesitatingly vote away billions to foreign peoples without scrutiny or serious argument and without a follow-up audit. The fact that the long-suffering American taxpayer must, in the end, foot the bill is inconsequential to the billion-voting mind. His imagination is intoxicated with Marshall Plans, and Mutual Security, and Foreign Operations Agencies, and the underwriting of the American standard of living throughout the globe.

Not long ago, an ambitious "One Worlder," Walter P. Reuther, even climbed up into the trillions. He soberly proposed that the United States, over the next century, should earmark two trillion dollars for "Aid" for foreign nations.

How did we get this way?

It has been a slow and erosive process, speeded in recent years by a steady parade of synthetic and government-made "emergencies," each leading to deeper descent into billion-dollar statesmanship. Americans still active in public life can remember the shudder which went over the country when we had our first billion-dollar-appropriating Congress. It came in the administration of Woodrow Wilson.

We raised our sights slightly when, under Wilson, we entered World War I. The total American bill for this war and its aftermath, which resulted in spectacular victory, was $66,592,966,000. Recently we spent more than double this amount in war and rearmament costs as a result of the Korean "police action" which ended up in the most humiliating defeat in American history, and 140,000 American casualties.

The dam went down with a crash under Franklin D. Roosevelt. One of the most portentous of FDR's achievements was that he made us a nation of billion-dollar-thinkers.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by Human Events, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When, in 1934, Roosevelt frightened Congress out of its eye teeth with his demand for $5 billion for the Hopkins-Ickes relief program, he was actually only softening up the American public for what was to come.

The billion era really picked up speed with the uncorking of Lend-Lease in 1940. Even the title was phoney. It was neither lend nor lease. Up to this time, government extravagance, where it had existed, had been restricted to domestic spending. We had kept the money at home. Wilson's World War I loans to the Allies were specifically not gifts; they were loans for which we billed the recipients sternly after Armistice Day, and a large portion of which we collected. When our Allies tried to welch, Calvin Coolidge was to give to history the precious observation: "They hired the money, didn't they?"

The Lend-Lease program set a new precedent. Although it was not spelled out at the time, Lend-Lease was turned over with little or no expectation that any substantial part of it would be returned. We had inaugurated the policy of international "giveaways."

Before Lend-Lease had run the course, it had cost us $40,674,000,000. Long before its end, it had lost all semblance of a lending operation. It had become a program of outright gifts. Nor was its purpose related exclusively to the financing of the war effort. After the war was ended, Lend-Lease spendings continued with $769,000,000 going to our Allies after V-J Day.

LEND-LEASE was the opening wedge to the admittance to the American mind of the fallacy which has done more to bedevil and pervert our foreign policies since 1945 than any other single delusion.

That fallacy is the belief that we can buy the kind of world that we want by outpourings of American dollars. Since 1945, in our relations with other countries, traditional diplomacy has given place to outright subsidization. Like the Roman Empire in its decadence, we have accepted the dangerous idea that we can keep peace in the world by placing all amenable nations on our payroll. It didn't work for Rome, and it isn't working for us. The concept, of course, is based upon a cynical view of human nature which disregards the basic wellsprings of human action. The Allies took our money but they were not bought. When we needed them, as in Korea, in Indo-China and elsewhere, they coldly reserved their individual right of decision. We found that we had subsidized, not allies, but neutralists.

As we shall see, much of the smoldering unfriendliness to the United States that exists in Europe and Asia stems from this mistaken Roosevelt-Truman policy of buying friendship, and to this unsound idea President Eisenhower seems to adhere. Nations proud in the traditions of a long and glorious national history, resent the implicit contempt in the American aid attitude. They accept our money, but they don't like the giver.

Once we accepted the subsidization thesis, the giveaway program became a non-stop enterprise. Lend-Lease flickered out in 1946, but it left UNRRA in its place to continue the spendings. The true UNRRA story has never been told; because UNRRA was an international agency, its records are beyond the subpoena and reach of a Congressional investigating committee.

Ostensibly UNRRA was financed jointly by the allied powers. Actually Uncle Sam again picked up the check. Our UNRRA spendings totalled $2,671,000,000. Even after it was disbanded, we were induced to allocate nearly a third of a billion dollars more to wind up its operations. With a total disregard of our national interests, UNRRA money was unreservedly given to the Communist-ruled nations behind the Iron Curtain to feed discontented peoples and to strengthen the Red grip on their governments. In the Far East, UNRRA money was even allocated to Mao Tse-tung to feed the Communist-occupied regions of China, and to harden Communist rule.

The real successor to Lend-Lease, however, was the Marshall Plan. Initially, this Plan had the objective of strengthening the Free World against Communism. In its first form, American money was to go to Russia and to the Iron-Curtain countries, as well as to the Free Nations. Had the Russians been more farsighted they would have taken our money, with their fingers crossed, to add to the $11 billion

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which they had gotten from us through Lend-Lease, using it to strengthen their military potential. But Russia in 1947 had other irons in the fire, and the Russians closed the door to the Marshall Plan for herself and her satellites.

The Free Nations eagerly embraced the Plan, and up to December 31, 1951, they had annexed $10,717,000,000 of American money for "Economic and Technical Assistance," and an additional $2,046,000,000 for "Military Aid." The Marshall Plan then merged with its successor, Mutual Security Administration. Under MSA, up to January 1, 1954, $16,231,700,000 in additional American money was appropriated exclusively for military aid to the Free Nations, of which $7,700,000,000 represented actual shipments, and the balance piled up on MSA books as unexpended balance to be spent in the future.

THE FLOW of American money abroad since 1945 has been a reckless and unregulated river. The astronomical sums to which these spendings have mounted stagger the imagination. Uncle Sam has been the great international Easy Touch to whom the whole non-Communist world has come in urgent parade for its share of the pickings.

All this has been done in the name of winning friendship for America. The price has been staggering, but still we have not won the friends. Like the proverbial parvenu we have tried heavy-handedly to buy our way into world leadership. We have not succeeded, but we have piled up a legacy of ill-will throughout the world and a back-breaking debt at home which is now returning to haunt us.

How else explain the open unfriendliness toward the United States that exists throughout Europe?

Dislike, even hatred of Americans, is endemic among our so-called allies. Let us glance briefly at a few random instances:

In Chateauroux, France, 156 miles south of Paris, is located one of America's great air bases. For two years, a great concentration of American airmen and mechanics has centered on this field. They have lived side by side with the French people in this community.

Not long ago, disturbed by some unfriendly episodes, the air force conducted a poll of the Chateauroux residents on their attitude toward Americans. The results were appalling.

Only 10 per cent of the Frenchmen sampled professed friendship for the Americans. Fifty-seven per cent expressed various shades of dislike and declared they wanted no association with the air base personnel. The balance had no opinion.

The sting of this is that Chateauroux is one of the bases which the United States maintains at great expense to secure France from possible attack from the East. We protect them but still they detest us.

In Britain, open dislike towards the United States is so thick you can cut it with a knife. The actions of ex-Prime Minister Clement Attlee, one of the most powerful political figures in England, in heading a delegation to Soviet Russia and Communist China, was a direct slap in the face of the United States, and reflects the unreasoning anti-American feeling which now pervades an influential segment of the British population.

The anti-American London *Mirror,* whose 4,000,000 readers make it a power to conjure with in England, has declared that three out of five Britishers are unfriendly to the United States, or are indifferent.

"We hate being dependent on Uncle Sam," the *Mirror* explained. "We distrust your stability, judgment and experience. We don't like the way you push us around."

This from a country whose safety is being aided day and night by American-manned and equipped air bases, with 70,000 Americans (including families) swallowing the inhospitality while standing guard.

India has received $278,000,000 in aid from the United States since she won her independence and is due to receive over $100,000,000 more in fiscal 1955. In the face of this, she has constituted herself the spearhead of every anti-American move in the United Nations. In America's fateful struggle with Red China, India has backstopped the Communists at every juncture.

In every discussion of Asia, over-optimistic Americans always bring up Japan as a reassuring hope. Unfortunately, even here we are engaged in specious wishful thinking.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Japan has received $2,439,000,000 in direct aid from the United States since she surrendered to General Douglas MacArthur in Tokyo Bay, and she has been sheltered from ever-threatening Soviet aggression by the presence of powerful American army, navy and air units, maintained at a cost of further American billions. But millions of her people are astir with anti-American feeling.

Under the deceptive facade of the pro-American Yoshida goverment, popular anti-Americanism inspired by Communists, runs life in Japan. On May Day, last year, an estimated 1,600,000 Japanese participated in nationwide anti-U.S. demonstrations. Incendiary banners appeared on the streets, and in the hands of demonstrators before American offices, crying: "Yankee, Go Home! Monkey, Go Home!" And so it goes, around the globe.

THIS IS A DARK BACKDROP of international hostility against which the United States conducts its foreign relations today. In this, the moment of American hegemony in the world, we face the world, friendless and unliked.

At any time prior to 1914, such American unpopularity abroad might have saddened the American people, but it would not have worried them.

We were a self-sufficient people. Washington's oft-quoted admonition to avoid European entanglements was the watchword of our foreign policy. Our commitments overseas (aside from this hemisphere) were confined to such innocuous international undertakings as the Universal Postal Union. We thought instinctively in terms of national interest, not of international responsibility.

For better or worse, the livid events of the last four decades have detached us permanently from this traditional policy. In the war-time phrase of Churchill our affairs have become "mixed" with those of Europe. America has accepted the role, and the fearful dangers, of world power. She has subordinated her foreign policy to the United Nations. Gradually but surely we have been drawn into an entangling net of foreign commitments and responsibilities which have permanently ended our isolation. As these self-imposed responsibilities have grown, so also has grown our peril.

Because we are no longer self-sufficient, the problem of friendly nations abroad is no longer academic. The goodwill of the Free World is a driving "must" for America. In a world which is sharply divided between Communism and Freedom, the unity of the non-Communist nations is a life-and-death issue. Such unity cannot exist in a poisonous atmosphere in which half the world is singing a song of hate against the United States.

Most Americans perceive these truths with more or less clarity, but they fail to relate them to appropriate action. They depend hopefully upon ill-conceived crisis-provoking propaganda that, all too often, actually worsens our present unstable international relations. They turn to the mumbo jumbo of psychology to resolve their perplexities.

No one seriously disputes the fact that telling the truth about America and Americans to foreigners has a place, and an important one, in America's international activities. But that is not the same thing as saying that its role is primary. It is only one among several decisive policies which America must explore if it is to survive. In reality we have been detouring our national energies into "gee whiz" activities at a critical time when they should have been focused on more mature and productive tasks.

It has been the tragedy of America that the promoters of propaganda and "cloak-and-dagger" juvenilities have been able to call the turns in Washington throughout the post-war years. They have led us up costly blind alleys of waste and futility. They have sold their bill of goods to the Eisenhower Administration, just as they sold it to Truman and Roosevelt. While they induce us to piddle with their sterile tasks, time for America is running out. There must be a searching re-appraisal of the whole field of American hand-outs to the world and the information efforts that stimulate these activities if we are to discover some of the reasons why America is both disliked and distrusted.

Additional Copies of Section II (the article section): 6 for $1; 10 for $1.50; 50 for $5.50; 100 for $10; 500 for $15; 1,000 for $25. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

HUMAN EVENTS, published at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is published in two parts: a 4-page news-section and a 4-page article (of which this section is an example). $10 per year. *Trial subscription for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for $1.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED